



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,644	03/15/2004	Ebe Hesterman	5041 0014US	8056

7590 10/31/2005

Dreiss, Fuhlendorf, Steimle & Becker
Patentanwalte
Postfach 10 37 62
Stuttgart, D-70032
GERMANY

EXAMINER

YAN, REN LUO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2854

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/799,644

Applicant(s)

HESTERMAN, EBE

Examiner

Ren L. Yan

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-8 and 10-12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/15/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election with traverse of Species I, with readable claims 1-12 and 16-20 in the reply filed on 8-15-2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that not only claim 1 but also claims 3-12 and 16-20 are all generic and therefore, claims 1-12 and 16-20 should be examined together. The examiner agrees with applicants' statement that claims 1-12 and 16-20 are all generic and therefore are being examined together. Non-elected claims 13-15 have been withdrawn for the time being from further consideration.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 5-8 and 10 are objected to because each of these claims recites a "can be..." functional statement without providing any structure to enable the functions referred to. Therefore, it is unclear what structure is required in order to give these claims proper consideration. Additionally, since the nature of the surface refinement has not been defined, claims 5-8 and 10 are further objected for the following reasons: in claim 5, the recitation of "surface refinement can be adjusted to a changed production speed" is not understood as to its meaning. How is the surface refinement related to the production speed is not clear; in claim 6, since the surface refinement has not been defined to have any shape or form, the recitation of "a peripheral direction" does not make any sense; in claim 7, the recitation of "a transverse direction" is also unclear what it refers to; and in claim 8, since the structural relationship between a feed table and the surface refinement station has not been defined, it is unclear how they can be adjusted together.

Claims 11 and 12 are also objected to because the recitation of “electrodes” lacks proper antecedent basis. It is unclear from reading these claims where these electrodes come from and what do they do in the printing machine.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-8, 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drapatsky et al(5,103,733) in view of applicant’s admitted prior art(AAPA). The ‘733 patent teaches the structure of a sheet-fed rotary printing machine as claimed including a sheet gripper system 12 for holding a sheet during printing at a printing speed, a feed system 10 disposed upstream of the sheet gripper system 12 for transporting the sheet to the sheet gripper system 12, and a feeder 18 disposed upstream of the feed system 10 to feed the sheet to the feed system 10. The rotational speed of the sheet gripper system 12, the feed system 10 and the feeder 18 can all be adjusted or synchronized by the controller 42 so as to enable continuous printing operation on sheets. See Fig. 4 and column 5, line 60 through column 7, line 50 in ‘733 patent for details. On pages 1-4 of the present specification, applicant readily discloses that surface refinement such as corona treatment on sheets prior to the sheets to be printed is well known in the printing art and widely practiced to increase the surface tension of the sheets and improve adhesion of the coating material and ink on sheets. In view of the AAPA, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the sheet-fed rotary printing machine of the ‘733 patent with a well known corona treatment station disposed between the sheet feeder and the sheet gripper

Art Unit: 2854

system so as to treat the sheets before they are printed in order to promote better ink adhesion on the sheets and thus to improve print quality. With respect to claims 3 and 4, to place the corona treatment station in such a way that the surface refinement is carried out from above or below the sheets would have been determined through routine experiment by those skilled in the art in order to achieve the best outcome. Such a determination through routine experiment would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. With respect to claims 11 and 16, the '733 patent shows the use of a stationary sheet guiding means 39 for guiding the sheet towards the gripper 15.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '733 patent in view of AAPA as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Dinter et al(5,135,724). The '733 patent, as modified by AAPA teaches all that is claimed except for the surface refinement station comprising two closed chambers which are disclosed above and below a passage of the sheet. Dinter et al teach in a sheet processing apparatus the conventional use of a corona treatment station 2 to increase adhesion of printing inks on sheets comprising two closed chambers which are disclosed one on each side of a passing sheet. See Fig. 1 in Dinter et al for example. It would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art to provide the printing machine of the '733 patent, as modified by AAPA with a corona treatment station having the form of two closed chambers disposed one on each side of the passing sheet in order to effectively treat the sheet passing through the corona treatment station before it being printed.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '733 patent in view of AAPA as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Wadlinger et al(6,490,974). The '733 patent, as modified by AAPA teaches all that is claimed except for the sheet guiding

Art Unit: 2854

means being able to pivot. The '974 patent teaches in a sheet-fed rotary printing machine the use of a sheet guide 15 that pivots. See Figs. 1-7 in '974 patent for example. It would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art to provide the printing machine of the '733 patent, as modified by AAPA, with the sheet guide that pivots so as to better guide the sheet during the sheet feeding operation.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '733 patent in view of AAPA as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of JP 59131460. The '733 patent, as modified by AAPA teaches all that is claimed except for the use of a neutral rod disposed downstream of the corona treatment station. JP 59131460 teaches in a sheet printing or coating machine that employs a corona treatment station 7 and the use of neutral rods 8 and 9 disposed downstream of the corona treatment station 7 and offset relative thereto in a direction towards the sheet to prevent contact between the sheet and the corona treatment station. See Fig. 2 in JP 59131460 for example. It would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art to provide the printing machine of the '733 patent, as modified by AAPA with the neutral rods appropriately disposed as taught by JP 59131460 in order to ensure the sheet being treated does not touch the surface of the corona discharger.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '733 patent in view of AAPA as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bayer et al(6,349,641). The '733 patent, as modified by AAPA teaches all that is claimed except for the machine being of a series construction. Bayer et al teach a multicolor sheet printing machine in that different colored printing units are arranged in series. See Fig. 1 of Bayer et al for example. It would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art to provide the printing machine of the

'733 patent, as modified by AAPA with multiple printing units arranged in series as taught by Bayer et al in order to carry out multicolor printing on sheets.


Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '733 patent in view of AAPA as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kamoda(6,311,616). The '733 patent, as modified by AAPA teaches all that is claimed except for the machine being of a satellite construction. Kamoda teaches a multicolor sheet printing machine in that different colored printing units are arranged in a satellite construction around a common cylinder 22. See Fig. 1 of Kamoda for example. It would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art to provide the printing machine of the '733 patent, as modified by AAPA with multiple printing units arranged in a satellite construction as taught by Kamoda in order to carry out multicolor printing on sheets.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ren L. Yan whose telephone number is 571-272-2173. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on 571-272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2854

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Ren L Yan
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2854

Ren Yan
Oct. 26, 2005